



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,010	09/21/2000	Uve Hansmann	IBM-116	8803

7590 06/28/2005  
Thomas A Beck  
26 Rockledge Lane  
New Milford, CT 06776

EXAMINER

MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/667,010

Applicant(s)

HANSMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Aravind K. Moorthy

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the request for continued examination filed on 13 June 2005.
2. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-11 have been rejected.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 13 June 2005 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

Art Unit: 2131

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

**6. Claims 1-4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al U.S. Patent No. 6,088,450.**

As to claim 1, Davis et al discloses a method for setting basic means of access for operation of devices of which the operation is controllable by electronic means, comprising:

the devices comprising mobile phones, small computer-controlled consumer devices with relatively low level of computing power, computers, motor vehicles, control terminals for industrial processes, all of which devices may require authentication prior to operation [column 3 line 52 to column 4 line 11];

establishment of a link between a personal authentication system supplied with encryption data and a logic system able to control an electronic device control [column 4, lines 12-19].

checking the encryption data in the authentication system prior to operation of the electronic device control [column 4, lines 12-19];

assignment of predetermined means of access to the electronic device control associated with the authentication system the predetermined means providing access to physical hardware resources and access to different software functions, based on the privileges of the user who identified himself to the system,

the software function evaluates a security token and is running on top of the physical hardware [column 5 line 50 to column 6 line 50];

enabling of the means for access predetermined for the authentication system dependent on the result of the check [column 5 line 50 to column 6 line 50].

As to claim 2, Davis et al discloses that the basic means of access to functions of the device comprise at least one of the following means: disable operation of the devices, enable operation of the devices, or enable configuration of the devices [column 5 line 50 to column 6 line 50].

As to claim 3, Davis et al discloses that the link is made without need for intermediate software layers [column 7, lines 35-62].

As to claim 4, Davis et al discloses in addition, the step of reading at least one of the following features embodied within the authentication system: firmware programs, device-specific command sequences for execution of specific device-specific functions, cryptographic keys, cryptographic algorithms, and individual decision-making logic [column 5, lines 34-49].

As to claim 10, Davis et al discloses program code areas for the execution or preparation for execution of the steps when the program is installed in a computer [column 5, lines 34-49].

As to claim 11, Davis et al discloses a method for setting basic means of access for operation of devices of which the operation is controllable by electronic means, comprising:

the devices comprising computer-controlled consumer devices with relatively low level of computing power, computers, motor vehicles, control

terminals for industrial processes, all of which devices may require authentication prior to operation [column 3 line 52 to column 4 line 11];

establishment of a link between a personal authentication system supplied with encryption data and a logic system able to control an electronic device control [column 4, lines 12-19].

checking the encryption data in the authentication system prior to operation of the electronic device control [column 4, lines 12-19];

assignment of predetermined means of access to the electronic device control associated with the authentication system the predetermined means providing access to physical hardware resources and access to different software functions, based on the privileges of the user who identified himself to the system, the software function evaluates a security token and is running on top of the physical hardware [column 5 line 50 to column 6 line 50];

enabling of the means for access predetermined for the authentication system dependent on the result of the check [column 5 line 50 to column 6 line 50].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**7. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al U.S. Patent No. 6,088,450 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Findikli et al U.S. Patent No. 6,415,144 B1.**

As to claim 5, Davis et al does not teach that the method includes configuration of the devices, by authorized persons. Davis et al does not teach that after successful authentication, device-specific configuration data are downloaded into the devices from the authentication system in accordance with the authentication systems or over a network.

Findikli et al teaches configuration of the devices, by authorized persons [column 1 line 61 to column 2 line 5]. Findikli et al teaches that device-specific configuration data are downloaded into the devices from the authentication system in accordance with the authentication systems or over a network [column 1 line 61 to column 2 line 5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Davis et al so that the method would have included configuration of the devices, by an authorized persons. After successful authentication, device-specific configuration data would have been downloaded into the devices from the authentication system in accordance with the authentication systems or over a network.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Davis et al by the teaching of Findikli et al because over-the-air teleservices provide the radio telecommunications system operators with greater flexibility in tailoring wireless devices to meet the needs of their subscribers [column 2, lines 6-10].

As to claim 6, Davis et al teaches execution setting basic means of access for operations [column 6, lines 26-50].

As to claim 7, Davis et al teaches authentication of a person or a group of people [column 6, lines 26-50].

As to claim 8, Davis et al teaches that the authentication system is implemented in the form of a Smartcard [column 4, lines 20-28].

As to claim 9, Davis et al teaches setting basic means of access for operation of devices of which the operation is controllable by electronic means, including at least one device and an authentication system [column 6, lines 26-50].




Art Unit: 2131


***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aravind K Moorthy   
June 22, 2005

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100